

# The Charlotte Journal.

T. J. HOLLAND,  
EDITOR AND PROPRIETOR.

VOLUME XX.

"Perpetual Vigilance is the Price of Liberty," for "Power is always Stealing from the Many to the Few."

CHARLOTTE, N. C. APRIL 3, 1850.

PUBLISHED WEEKLY.  
AT \$2 PER ANNUM IN ADVANCE.

NUMBER 18.

## Speech of Mr. Webster,

IN THE UNITED STATES SENATE,  
ON THE COMPROMISE RESOLUTIONS,  
March 7, 1850.

[Continued.]

Mr. President, sometimes, when a man is found in a new relation to things around him and to other men, he says the world has changed, and that he has not changed. I believe, sir, that our self-respect leads us often to make this declaration in regard to ourselves when it is not exactly true. An individual is more apt to change, perhaps, than all the world around him is to change. But, under the present circumstances, and under the responsibility which I know I incur by what I am now stating here, I feel at liberty to recur to the various expressions and statements, made at various times, of my own opinion and resolution respecting the admission of Texas, and all that has followed.

Sir, as early as 1836, or in the early part of 1837, a matter of conversation and correspondence between myself and some private friends was the project of annexing Texas to the United States; and an honorable gentleman with whom I have had a long acquaintance, a friend of mine, now perhaps in the chamber of some Gen. Hamilton, of South Carolina, was known to that correspondence. I had voted for the recognition of Texas independence, because I believed it was an existing fact, surprising and astonishing as it was, and I wished well to the new republic; but I manifested from the first opposition to bringing her with her territory into the Union. I had occasion, sir, in 1837, to meet friends in New York, on some political occasion, and I then stated my sentiments upon the subject. It was the first time that I had occasion to advert to it; and I will ask a friend near me to do me the favor to read an extract from the speech, for the Senate may find it rather tedious to listen to the whole of it. It was delivered in Noble's garden in 1837.

Mr. Greene then read the following extract from the speech of the honorable Senator, to which he referred:

"Gentlemen, we all see that, by whomsoever possessed, Texas is likely to be a slaveholding country; and I frankly avow my entire unwillingness to do any thing which shall extend the slavery of the African race on this continent, or add other slaveholding States to the Union.

"When I say that I regard slavery in itself as a great moral, social, and political evil, I only use language which has been adopted by distinguished men, themselves citizens of slaveholding States.

"I shall do nothing, therefore, to favor or encourage its further extension. We have slavery already among us. The constitution found it among us; it recognized and gave it solemn guarantees.

"To the full extent of these guarantees, we are all bound in honor, in justice, and by the constitution. All the stipulations contained in the constitution in favor of the slaveholding States, which are already in the Union, ought to be fulfilled, and so far as depends on me, shall be fulfilled in the fulness of their spirit and to the exactness of their letter. Slavery as it exists in the States is beyond the reach of Congress. It is a concern of the States themselves. They have never submitted it to Congress, and Congress has no rightful power over it.

"I shall conceal, therefore, in no act, no measure, no intimation, no declaration of purpose which shall interfere or threaten to interfere with the exclusive authority of the several States over the subject of slavery, and exist within their respective limits. All this appears to me to be matter of plain and imperative duty.

"But when we come to speak of admitting new States, the subject assumes an entirely different aspect. Our rights and our duties are then both different.

"I see, therefore, no political necessity for the annexation of Texas to the Union—no advantages to be derived from it; and objections to it of a strong, and, in my judgment, of a decisive character."

Mr. Webster. I have nothing, sir, to add to nor to take back from these sentiments. That, the Senate will perceive, was in 1837. The purpose of immediately annexing Texas at that time was abandoned or postponed; and it was not revived with any vigor for some years. In the meantime it had so happened that I had become a member of the Executive Administration, and was for a short period in the Department of State. The annexation of Texas had become a subject of conversation—not confidential—with the President and heads of Departments, as well as with other public men. No serious attempt was then made to bring it about. I left the Department of State in May, 1843, and shortly after I learned, though not with connected with official information, that a design had been taken up of bringing in Texas, with her slave territory and population, into the United States. I was here in Washington at the time, and the persons are now here who will remember that we had an arranged meeting for conversation upon it. I went home to Massachusetts and proclaimed the existence of that purpose, but I could get no audience, and but little attention. Some did not believe it, and some were engaged in their own pursuits. They had gone to their farms, or to their mercantile, and it was impossible to arouse any sentiment in New England or in Massachusetts that should combine the two great political parties against this annexation; and, indeed, there was no hope of bringing the Northern Democracy into their view, for the leaning was all the other way.

But, sir, even with Whigs, and leading Whigs, I am ashamed to say, there was a great indifference towards the admission of Texas with slave territory into this Union. It went on. I was then out of Congress. The annexation resolutions passed the 1st of March, 1845. Texas complied with them; the Legislature of Texas complied with the conditions and accepted the guarantees; for the phrenology of the language of the resolution is, that Texas is to come in "upon the conditions and under the guarantees herein prescribed." I happened to be returned to the Senate in March, 1845, and was here in December, 1845, when the acceptance by Texas of the conditions proposed by Congress were laid before us by the President, and an act for the consummation of the connexion was laid before the two Houses. The connexion was not completed. A final law doing the deed of annexation ultimately had not been passed; and when it was upon its final passage here, I expressed my opposition to it and recorded my vote in the negative; and there that vote stands, with the observations that I made upon that occasion. It happened that between 1837 and this time, on various occasions and opportunities, I had expressed my entire opposition to the admission of slave States, or the acquisition of a new slave territory, to be added to the United States. I know, sir, no change in my own sentiments or my own purposes in that respect. I will now again ask my friend from Rhode Island to read another extract from a speech of mine, made at a Whig Convention in Springfield, Massachusetts, in the month of September, 1847.

Mr. Greene here read the following extract:

"We hear much just now of a panacea for the dangers and evils of slavery and slave annexation, which they call the 'Wilmot proviso.' That certainly is a just sentiment, but it is not a sentiment to found any new party upon. It is not a sentiment on which Massachusetts Whigs differ. There is not a man in this hall who holds to it more firmly than I do, nor any who adheres to it more than another.

"I feel some little interest in this matter, sir. Did I count myself in 1838 to the whole doctrine, fully, entirely? And I must be permitted to say that I cannot quite consent that more recent discoveries should claim the merit and take out a patent.

"I deny the propriety of their invention. Allow me to say, sir, it is not their discovery. We are to use the first and last adverb every occasion which offers to oppose the extension of slave power.

"But I speak of it here, as in Congress, as a political question, a question for a statesman to act upon. We must so regard it. I certainly do not mean to say that it is less important in a moral point of view, that it is not more important in many other points of view, but, as a legislator, or in any official capacity, I must look at it, consider it and decide it as a matter of political action."

Mr. Webster. On other occasions, in debate here, I have expressed my determination to vote for no requisition, or cession or annexation, North or South, East or West. My opinion has been that we have territory enough, and that we should follow the Spanish maxim, 'improve, adorn what we have, seek no further.' I think that it was in some observation that I made here on the three million loan bill that I avowed that sentiment. In short, sir, the sentiment has been avowed quite as often, in as many places, and before as many assemblies, as any of the humble sentiments of mine ought to be avowed.

But now, under certain conditions, Texas, as well as all her territories, as a slave State, with a solemn pledge that if she is divided into many States, those States may come in as slave States south of 36 30, how are we to deal with all those no way of honorable legislation but, when the proper time comes for the enactment, to carry into effect all that we have stipulated to do. I do not entirely agree with my honorable friend from Tennessee, (Mr. Bell) that, as soon as the time comes when she is entitled to another Representative, we should create a new State. The only regard to it I take to be this; that when we have created a new State out of territory, we have generally gone upon the idea that there is population enough to form a State, sixty thousand or some such thing, we could create a State; but it may be thought quite a different thing when a State is divided, and two or more States made out of it. It does not follow, in such a case, that the same rule of appointment should be applied.

First, however, is a matter for the consideration of Congress when the proper time arrives. I am not here. I may have no vote to give, on the occasion, but I wish it to be distinctly understood to-day, that, according to my view of the matter, this Government is solemnly pledged by law to create new States out of Texas, with her consent, when her population shall justify such a proceeding, and so far as such States are formed out of Mexican territory lying South of 36 30 to let them come in as slave States. This is the meaning of the resolution which our friends, the Northern Democracy, have left us to fulfil; and for me, mean to fulfil it; because I will not violate the faith of the Government.

Now, as to California and New Mexico, I hold slavery to be excluded from those Territories by a law, even superior to that which admits and sanctions it in Texas. I mean the law of nature—of physical geography—the law of the formation of the earth. That law settles forever, with a strength beyond all terms of human enactment, that slavery can not exist in California or New Mexico. Understand me, sir; I mean slavery—slavery as we regard it; slaves in the grove, of the col-

ored race transferable by sale and delivery like other property. I shall not discuss that point. I leave it to the learned gentlemen who have undertaken to discuss it; but I suppose there is no slave of that description in California now. I understand that *peoniam*, a sort of penal servitude exists there, or rather a spring for debt, as it is arranged and exists in some parts of California and New Mexico. But what I mean to say is, that African slavery, as we are to find it, is an utterly impossible to find itself, or to be found in Mexico, as any other natural impossibility. California and New Mexico are Asiatic in their formation and scenery. They are composed of steep edges of mountains of enormous height, with sometimes broken ridges of deep valleys. The sides of these mountains are barren, entirely barren, their tops engaged by perpetual snow. There may be in California, now made free by its constitution, and no doubt there are some valuable tracts of land. But it is not in New Mexico. Pay, what is the evidence which any gentleman has obtained on this subject, from information sought by himself or communicated by others. I have inquired and read all I could in order to obtain information on this subject. What is there in New Mexico that could possibly induce any body to go there with slaves? There are some narrow strips of fertile land on the borders of the rivers; but the rivers themselves dry up before the mountains is gone. All that the people can do is to raise some little articles, some little wheat for their families, and all that by irrigation. And who expects to see a hundred black men cultivating tobacco, corn, cotton, or any thing else, on lands in New Mexico made fertile only by irrigation? I look upon it, therefore, as a fixed fact, to use an expression current to-day, that both California and New Mexico are destined to be free, so far as they are settled at all, which I believe, especially in regard to New Mexico, will be very little for a great length of time; free by the arrangement of things by the Power above us. I have therefore to say, in this respect also, that this country is fixed for freedom, so many persons as shall ever live there, by an irrevocable and more irrevocable law than the law that attaches to the right of holding slaves in Texas; and I will say further, that if a resolution or a law were now before us to provide a Territorial Government for New Mexico, I would not vote to put any prohibition into it whatever. The use of such a prohibition would be idle, as it respects any effect it would have upon the Territory; and I would not take pains to reform an ordinance of Nature, nor to re-nact the will of God. And I would put in no will nor provision for the purpose of a tam or a reproach. I would put in no evidence of the votes of superior power, to wound the pride, even whether a just pride, a rational pride, or an irrational pride, to wound the pride of the gentleman who people the Southern States. I have no such object, no such purpose. They would think it a tam, an indignity; they would think it to be an act taken away from them that they regard a proper equality of privilege; and whether they expect to realize any benefit from it or not, they would think it a theoretic wrong; that something more or less derogatory to their character and their rights had taken place. I propose to fulfil no such wound upon any body, unless something essentially important to the country, and efficient to the preservation of liberty and freedom, is to be effected. Therefore, I repeat sir, and I repeat it because I wish to be understood, that I do not propose to address the Senate upon this subject. I desire to pour out all my heart in as plain a manner as possible; and I say, again, that if a proposition were now here for a Government for New Mexico, and it was moved to insert a provision for a prohibition of slavery, I would not vote for it.

Now, Mr. President, I have established, as far as I proposed to go into any line of observation to establish, the proposition with which I set out, and upon which I propose to stand or fall; and that is, that the whole territory of the States in the United States, or in the nearly required territory of the United States, has a fixed and settled character, now fixed and settled by law, which cannot be repealed in the case of Texas without a violation of public faith, and cannot be repealed by any human power in regard to California or New Mexico; that, under one or the other of those laws, every foot of territory in the States or in the Territories has now received a fixed and decided character.

Sir, if we were now making a Government for New Mexico, and any body should propose a Wilmot proviso, I should treat it exactly as Mr. Polk treated that provision for excluding slavery from Oregon. Mr. Polk was known to be in opinion decidedly averse to the Wilmot proviso; but he felt the necessity of establishing a Government for the Territory of Oregon, and though the proviso was there, he knew it would be entirely nugatory; and since it must be entirely nugatory, since it took away no right, no desirable, no estimable, no weighable, no tangible right of the South, he said he would sign the bill for the sake of enacting a law to form a Government in that Territory, and let that entirely useless, and in that connexion entirely senseless, proviso remain. For myself, I will say that we hear much of the annexation of Canada; and if there be any man, any of the Northern Democracy, or any one of the Free Soil party, who supposes it necessary to insert a Wilmot proviso in a Territorial Government for New Mexico, that man will of course be of opinion that it is necessary to protect the everlasting snows of Canada from the foot of slavery by the same overpowering wing of an act of Congress. Sir, wherever there is to be a particular good to be done; wherever there is a foot of land to be said back from becoming slave territory, I am ready to assert the principle of the exclusion of slavery. I am pledged to it from the year 1837; I have been pledged to it again and again; and I will perform those pledges; but I will not do a thing unnecessary, that would wound the feelings of others, or that does disgrace to my own understanding.

Mr. President, in the excited times in which we live, there is found to exist a state of crimination and recrimination between the North and South. There are lists of grievances produced by each; and those grievances, real or supposed, alienate the mind of one portion of the country from the other, exasperate the feelings, subvert the sense of fraternal connexion and patriotic love and mutual regard. I shall bestow a little attention, sir, upon those various grievances produced on the one side and on the other. I begin with the complaints of the South. I will not answer, further than I have, the general statements of the honorable Senator from South Carolina, that the North has grown upon the South in consequence of the manner of administering this Government, in the collecting of its revenues and so forth. They are disputed topics, and I have no inclination to enter into them. But I will state these complaints; especially one complaint of the South, which has in my opinion just foundation; and that is, that there has been found at the North, among individuals and among the legislatures of the North, a disinclination to perform fully their constitutional duties in regard to the return of persons bound to service who have escaped into the free States.

In that respect, it is my judgment that the South is right and the North is wrong. Every member of every Northern Legislature is bound by oath to support the Constitution of the United States; and this article of the constitution, which says to these States they shall deliver up fugitives from service, is as binding in honor and conscience as any other article. No man fulfils his duty in any Legislature who sets himself to find excuses, evasions, escapes from this constitutional duty. I have always thought that the constitution addressed itself to the Legislatures of the States themselves. It is said that those persons escaping into other States shall be delivered up, and I confess I have always been of the opinion that it was an injunction upon the States themselves. When it is said, that a person escaping into another State, shall be delivered up, it seems to me that the import of the passage is, that the State itself, in obedience to the constitution, shall cause him to be delivered up. That is my judgment. I have always entertained it, and I entertain it now. But when the subject, some years ago, was before the Supreme Court of the United States, the majority of the judges held that power to cause fugitives from service to be delivered up was a power to be exercised under the authority of this Government.

I do not know, on the whole, that it may not have been a fortunate decision. My hubbub is to respect the result of judicial deliberations and the solemnity of judicial decisions. But as it now stands, the business of seeing that these fugitives are delivered up resides in the power of Congress and the national judiciary, and my friend at the head of the Judiciary Committee has a bill on the subject now before the Senate, with some amendments to it, which I propose to support, with all its provisions, to the fullest extent. And I desire to call the attention of all sober-minded men, of all conscientious men in the North, of all men who are not carried away by any fanciful idea or by any false idea whatever, to their constitutional obligations. I put it to all the sober and sound minds at the North as a question of conscience. What right have they, in their legislative capacity, or any other, to endeavor to get round this constitution, to embarrass the free exercise of the rights secured by the constitution to the persons whose slaves escape from them? None at all; none at all. Neither in the forum of conscience nor before the face of the constitution are they justified, in my opinion. Of course it is a matter for their consideration. They probably, in the turmoil of the times, have not stopped to consider of this; they have followed what seems to be the current of thought and of motives for the occasion, and the neglect to investigate fully the real question, and to consider their constitutional obligation; as I am sure, if they did consider, they would fulfil them with alacrity. Therefore, I repeat, sir, that there is a ground of complaint against the North well founded, which ought to be removed, which it is now in the power of the different departments of this Government to remove; which calls for the enactment of proper laws authorizing the judiciary of this Government, in the several States, to do all that is necessary for the recapture of fugitive slaves, and for the restoration of them to those who claim them. Wherever I go, and whenever I speak on the subject—and when I speak here I desire to speak to the whole North—I say that the South has been injured in this respect, and has a right to complain; and the North has been too careless of what I think the constitution peremptorily and emphatically enjoins upon it as a duty.

Complaint has been made against certain resolutions that emanate from Legislatures at the North, and are sent here to us, not only on the subject of slavery in this District, but sometimes recommending Congress to consider the means of abolishing slavery in the States. I should be sorry to be called upon to present any resolutions here which could not be referable to any committee or any power in Congress, and, therefore, I should be unwilling to receive from the Legislature of Massachusetts any instructions to present resolutions expressive of any opinion whatever on the subject of slavery, for two reasons; because, first, I do not consider that the Legislature of Massachusetts has any thing to do with it; and next, I do not consider that I, as her representative here, have any thing to do with it. Sir, it has become, in my opinion, quite too common a practice for the State Legislatures to present resolutions here on all subjects, and to instruct us here on all subjects.

There is no public man that requires instruction more than I do, or who requires information more than I do, or desires it more heartily; but I do not like to have it come in quite too imperative a shape. I took notice, with pleasure, of some remarks upon this subject made the other day in the Senate of Massachusetts, by a young man of talent and character, from whom the best hopes may be entertained. I mean Mr. Hilliard. He told the Senate of Massachusetts that he would vote for no instructions whatever to be forwarded to members of Congress, nor for any resolutions to be offered, expressive of the sense of Massachusetts as to what their members of Congress ought to do. He said that he saw no propriety in one set of public servants giving instructions and reading lectures to another set of public servants. To their own master all of them must stand or fall, and that master is their constituents. I wish these sentiments could become more common a great deal more common. I have never entered into the question, and never shall, about the binding force of instructions. I will however, simply say this: if there be any matter of interest pending in this body, while I am a member of it, in which Massachusetts has an interest of her own not adverse to the general interest of the country, I shall pursue her instructions with gladness of heart, and with all the efficiency which I can bring here. But if the question be one which affects her interest, and at the same time effects the interests of all the other States, I shall no more regard her political wishes or instructions, than I would regard the wishes of a man who might appoint me an arbitrator or referee to decide some question of important private right. If ever there was a Government upon earth, it is this Government; if ever there was a body upon earth it is this body, which should consider itself as composed by agreement of all, appointed by some, but organized by the general consent of all, sitting here under the solemn obligations of oath and conscience to do that which they think is the best for the good of the whole.

Then, sir, there are those abolition societies, of which I am unwilling to speak, but in regard to which I have very clear notions and opinions. I do not think them useful. I think their operations for the last twenty years have produced nothing good or valuable. At the same time, I know thousands of them are honest and good men; perfectly well meaning men. They have excited feelings, they think they must do something for the cause of liberty, and in their sphere of action they do not see what else they can do, than to contribute to an abolition press or an abolition society, or to pay an abolition lecturer. I do not mean to impute gross motives even to the leaders of these societies, but I am not blind to the consequences. I cannot but see what mischief their interference with the South has produced. And is it not plain to all that recur to the debates in the Virginia House of Delegates in 1832, and he will see with what freedom a proposition made by Mr. Randolph for the gradual abolition of slavery was discussed in that body. Every one spoke of slavery as he thought; very ignorant and disparaging names and epithets were applied to it. The debates in the House of Delegates on that occasion, I believe, were all published. They were read by every colored man who could read, and if there were any who could not read, those debates were read to them by white men. At that time Virginia was not unwilling nor afraid to discuss this question, and to let that part of her population know as much of it as they could learn. That was in 1832. As has been said by the honorable member from Carolina, these abolition societies commenced their course of action in 1835. It is said—I do not know how true it may be—that they sent incendiary publications into the slave States; at any event, they attempted to arouse, and did arouse a very strong feeling; in other words, they created great agitation in the North against Southern slavery. Well, what was the result? The bonds of the slaves were bound more firmly than before; their rivets were more strongly fastened. Public opinion, which in Virginia had begun to be exhibited against slavery, and was opening up for the discussion of the question, drew back and shut itself up in its castle. I wish to know whether any body in Virginia can now talk as Mr. Randolph, Gov. McDowell, and others talked there, openly, and sent their remarks to the press in 1832. We all know the fact, and we all know the cause, and every thing that this agitating people have done has been, not to enlarge but to restrain, not to set free, but to bind faster the slave population of the South. That is my judgment. Sir, as I have said, I know many of them in my own neighborhood, very honest good people, misled, as I think, by strange enthusiasm; but they wish to do something,

and they are called on to contribute, and they do contribute; and it is my firm opinion this day, that within the last twenty years as much money has been collected and paid to the abolition societies, abolition presses, and abolition lecturers, as would purchase the freedom of every slave man, woman, and child in the State of Maryland, and send them all to Liberia. I have no doubt of it. But I have yet to learn that the benevolence of these abolition societies has at any time taken that particular turn. (Laughter.)

Again, sir, the violence of the press is complained of. The press violent! Why, sir, the press is violent every where. There are outrageous reproaches in the North against the South, and there are reproaches in not much better taste in the South against the North. Sir, the extremists of both parts of this country are violent; they mistake loud and violent talk for eloquence and for reason. They think that he who talks the loudest reasons the best. And this we must expect, when the press is free, as it is here, and I trust always will be—for, with all its licentiousness, and all its evil, the entire and absolute freedom of the press is essential to the preservation of government on the basis of a free constitution. Wherever it exists, there will be foolish paragraphs and violent paragraphs in the press, as they are, I am sorry to say, foolish speeches and violent speeches in both Houses of Congress. In short, sir, I must say that, in my opinion, the vernacular tongue of the country has become greatly vitiated, depraved, and corrupted by the style of our congressional debates. (Laughter.) And if it were possible for our debates in Congress to vitiate the principles of the people as much as they have depraved their taste, I should cry out, "God save the Republic!"

Well, in all this I see no solid grievance, no grievance produced by the South, within the address of the Government, but the single one to which I have referred; and that is, the want of a proper regard to the injunction of the constitution for the delivery of fugitive slaves.

There are also complaints of the North against the South. I need not go over them particularly. The first and gravest is, that the North adopted the constitution, recognising the existence of slavery in the States, and recognising the right to a certain extent of representation of the slaves in Congress, under a state of sentiment and expectation which would not now exist; and that, by events, by circumstances, by the eagerness of the South to acquire territory and extend their slave population, the North finds itself, in regard to the influence of the South and North, of the free States and slave States, where it never did expect to find itself when they entered the compact of the constitution. They complain, therefore, that instead of slavery being regarded as an evil, as it was then, an evil which all hoped would be extinguished gradually, it is now regarded by the South as an institution to be cherished and preserved and extended; an institution which the South has extended to the utmost of her powers by the acquisition of new territory. Well, then, past and every body reads what ever the newspapers contain; and the newspapers, some of them, especially those presses to which I have alluded, are careful to spread about among the people every reproachful sentiment uttered by any Southern man bearing at all against the North, every thing that is calculated to exasperate, to alienate; and there are many such things, as every body will admit, from the South or some portion of it, which are spread abroad among the reading people; and they do exasperate, and alienate, and produce a most mischievous effect upon the public mind at the North. Sir, I would not notice details of this sort appearing in obscure quarters; but one thing has occurred in this debate which struck me very forcibly. An honorable member from Louisiana addressed us the other day on this subject. I suppose there is not a more amiable and worthy gentleman in this chamber—a gentleman who would be more slow to give offence to any body, and he did not mean in his remarks to give offence. But what did he say? Why sir, he took pains to run a contrast between the slaves of the South and the laboring people of the North, giving preference in all points of condition, and comfort, and happiness, to the slaves of the South. The Senator doubtless did not suppose that he gave offence, or did any injustice. He was merely expressing his opinion. But does he know how remarks of that sort will be received by the laboring people of the North? They are the North. They are the people who cultivate their own farms with their own hands; freeholders, educated men, independent men. Let me say, sir, that five-sixths of the whole population of the North is in the hands of the laborers of the North, they cultivate their farms, they educate their children, they provide the means of independence; if they are not freeholders, they earn wages, these wages accumulate, are turned into capital, into new freeholders, and small capitalists are created. That is the case. And what can these people think when so respectable and worthy a gentleman as the member from Louisiana undertakes to prove that the absolute ignorance and the abject slavery of the South is more in conformity with the high purposes of immortal, rational, human being, than the educated, the independent free laborers of the North.

Now, sir, so far as any of these grievances have their foundation in matters of law, they can be redressed; so far as they have their foundation in matters of opinion, sentiment, in mutual crimination and recrimination

and they are called on to contribute, and they do contribute; and it is my firm opinion this day, that within the last twenty years as much money has been collected and paid to the abolition societies, abolition presses, and abolition lecturers, as would purchase the freedom of every slave man, woman, and child in the State of Maryland, and send them all to Liberia. I have no doubt of it. But I have yet to learn that the benevolence of these abolition societies has at any time taken that particular turn. (Laughter.)

Again, sir, the violence of the press is complained of. The press violent! Why, sir, the press is violent every where. There are outrageous reproaches in the North against the South, and there are reproaches in not much better taste in the South against the North. Sir, the extremists of both parts of this country are violent; they mistake loud and violent talk for eloquence and for reason. They think that he who talks the loudest reasons the best. And this we must expect, when the press is free, as it is here, and I trust always will be—for, with all its licentiousness, and all its evil, the entire and absolute freedom of the press is essential to the preservation of government on the basis of a free constitution. Wherever it exists, there will be foolish paragraphs and violent paragraphs in the press, as they are, I am sorry to say, foolish speeches and violent speeches in both Houses of Congress. In short, sir, I must say that, in my opinion, the vernacular tongue of the country has become greatly vitiated, depraved, and corrupted by the style of our congressional debates. (Laughter.) And if it were possible for our debates in Congress to vitiate the principles of the people as much as they have depraved their taste, I should cry out, "God save the Republic!"

Well, in all this I see no solid grievance, no grievance produced by the South, within the address of the Government, but the single one to which I have referred; and that is, the want of a proper regard to the injunction of the constitution for the delivery of fugitive slaves.

There are also complaints of the North against the South. I need not go over them particularly. The first and gravest is, that the North adopted the constitution, recognising the existence of slavery in the States, and recognising the right to a certain extent of representation of the slaves in Congress, under a state of sentiment and expectation which would not now exist; and that, by events, by circumstances, by the eagerness of the South to acquire territory and extend their slave population, the North finds itself, in regard to the influence of the South and North, of the free States and slave States, where it never did expect to find itself when they entered the compact of the constitution. They complain, therefore, that instead of slavery being regarded as an evil, as it was then, an evil which all hoped would be extinguished gradually, it is now regarded by the South as an institution to be cherished and preserved and extended; an institution which the South has extended to the utmost of her powers by the acquisition of new territory. Well, then, past and every body reads what ever the newspapers contain; and the newspapers, some of them, especially those presses to which I have alluded, are careful to spread about among the people every reproachful sentiment uttered by any Southern man bearing at all against the North, every thing that is calculated to exasperate, to alienate; and there are many such things, as every body will admit, from the South or some portion of it, which are spread abroad among the reading people; and they do exasperate, and alienate, and produce a most mischievous effect upon the public mind at the North. Sir, I would not notice details of this sort appearing in obscure quarters; but one thing has occurred in this debate which struck me very forcibly. An honorable member from Louisiana addressed us the other day on this subject. I suppose there is not a more amiable and worthy gentleman in this chamber—a gentleman who would be more slow to give offence to any body, and he did not mean in his remarks to give offence. But what did he say? Why sir, he took pains to run a contrast between the slaves of the South and the laboring people of the North, giving preference in all points of condition, and comfort, and happiness, to the slaves of the South. The Senator doubtless did not suppose that he gave offence, or did any injustice. He was merely expressing his opinion. But does he know how remarks of that sort will be received by the laboring people of the North? They are the North. They are the people who cultivate their own farms with their own hands; freeholders, educated men, independent men. Let me say, sir, that five-sixths of the whole population of the North is in the hands of the laborers of the North, they cultivate their farms, they educate their children, they provide the means of independence; if they are not freeholders, they earn wages, these wages accumulate, are turned into capital, into new freeholders, and small capitalists are created. That is the case. And what can these people think when so respectable and worthy a gentleman as the member from Louisiana undertakes to prove that the absolute ignorance and the abject slavery of the South is more in conformity with the high purposes of immortal, rational, human being, than the educated, the independent free laborers of the North.

Now, sir, so far as any of these grievances have their foundation in matters of law, they can be redressed; so far as they have their foundation in matters of opinion, sentiment, in mutual crimination and recrimination